

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 19-20 stand rejected. No changes to the claims are presented in this Response. Thus, Claims 1-8 and 19-20 are pending in the application.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent Claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,987,611 to Freund et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,801,747 to Bedard and in further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,486,892 to Stern. The Examiner cited Freund for disclosing a timer based method of controlling user access to the Internet. Freund is further cited for suggesting "that it may be beneficial to limit access based on the content category of Internet sites." However, Freund merely "prohibits access to a specific list of sites." Col. 9, line 13. Freund does not mention providing timed access to the listed sites or organizing the listed sites into categories.

Freund describes a system and method for client-based monitoring and filtering of access, which operates in conjunction with a centralized enforcement supervisor. A client side filter controlled by the centralized enforcement supervisor is employed. See col. 12, lines 45-54. Freund describes allowing timed access based on connection time to the Internet or interactive use time with the Internet. See col. 13, lines 2-10. Freund does not employ categories or even a list of uniform resource locators (URLs) in its process of allowing timed access to the Internet.

Separately from providing timed access, Freund discloses using a simple go/no go list of URLs to prevent access. Freund discloses an example where the list of URLs includes Internet pornographic sites. See col. 9, lines 38-41. Nowhere does Freund even mention the list of URLs contains multiple content categories or mention the use of a timer in combination with Internet pornographic sites. Freund is not allowing timed access to the list of URLs. Freund only discloses preventing access to the list of URLs. As explained above, timed access is employed in connection with all Internet content, not with content categories. Accordingly, there is no time tracking of user access to even one category of Internet sites. Further, Freund does not disclose how one would combine its list of go/no go URLs with the time related rules disclosed in Freund since the time related rules are in no way associated with the content of the requested site.

Bedard is cited for teaching "a method of monitoring including a profile that can be used to control the amount of time that information can be accessed for a particular category of content." Notably, Bedard is titled "Method and Apparatus for Creating a Television Viewer

Profile.” Emphasis added. Consistent with its title and description and as recognized in the Office Action, Bedard is concerned with television viewing habits by creating a viewer profile. The viewer profile is implemented in a viewer interface such as a television set-top box. Col. 3, lines 4-8. A user of the Bedard system can lock out television channels based on time parameters and channel type, i.e. sports. Col. 8, lines 2-6. Such an implementation amounts to a client-based filter of television channels.

The Examiner opines that it would be obvious at the time of the invention (more than a decade ago) to combine Freund’s simple go/no go list of Internet pornographic sites (URLs) used to prevent access with the client-based television viewer profile teachings of Bedard because it “would allow a user of Freund’s system to more broadly characterize rules instead of having to type each website in manually.” However, Freund’s “rules” amount to a go/no go list of Internet pornographic sites (URLs) while the foundation of Bedard’s viewer profile is television channels. There is no mention how, let alone why, a person having ordinary skill in the art would combine the television viewer profile from Bedard (channels ESPN, BRV, SC, DSC and viewing units as illustrated in Figure 2 from Bedard) with a list of Internet pornographic sites (URLs). Besides the unworkable premise of combining Freund’s Internet and website based filter system with the television based viewer profile method from Bedard, if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). M.P.E.P. 2143.01(V).

As explained above, Freund discloses a client side filter controlled by the centralized enforcement supervisor. See col. 12, lines 45-54. The centralized supervisor maintains the access rules for the client based filter and verifies the existence and proper operation of the client based filter application. See col. 3, lines 63-67. Unlike Freund, Bedard simply allows the user to ‘lock out’ specified channels or limit their viewing independent of any centralized supervisor. Freund teaches against the fundamental premise of such client-based filtering, as disclosed in Bedard. See col.3, lines 25-34 of Freund. Thus, the examiner’s proposed combination of Freund with Bedard’s client based television filtering would frustrate Freund’s use of a centralized supervisor and its explicit teachings against client based filtering.

Further, the examiner cites to Stern (USPN 6,486,892) for showing the “use of the same profile and rules for managing both internet content and television content.” While Stern does

disclose creating user profiles as does Bedard, nowhere does Stern disclose the use of rules based on time and categories or even any "rule" restricting a user in anyway. Instead of restricting, Stern is directed to "accessing, generating, presenting and manipulating Internet and non-Internet related information, data and content, including information netcast over the Internet." Abstract. Thus, neither Freund, Bedard or Stern, nor a combination of Freund with Bedard and Stern teaches a system that uses content categories to provide timed access to Internet sites.

Accordingly, the applied references do not disclose or teach at least the steps recited in Claims 1 and 19. Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 19 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action is inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the noted rejections and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain of if an issue requires clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' attorney in order to resolve any such issue promptly. Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/17/09

By: 

James F. Herkenhoff
Registration No. 51,241
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550